

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 and 81-89 are currently pending. Claims 1 and 14 are amended herewith. Based on the amendments and the following remarks, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the Application.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of *Isfeld*, *Hagsand* and *Chuprun*

The Examiner rejects claims 1-6, 8-10, 12-19, 21-23, 25-26 and 81-89 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 5,828,835 (*Isfeld*) in view of United States Patent No. 7,254,142 (*Hagsand*) and United States Patent No. 6,115,580 (*Chuprun*). The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The cited art does not disclose or suggest each element of claim 1.

Among other limitations, claim 1 recites:

determining a route for a unidirectional channel from a source processing node in an **array of processing nodes having locations** to a destination processing node in the array of processing nodes, wherein **the location of the source processing node relative to the location of the destination node is fixed during data transmission**, and wherein the determined route is based on a physical description of the array of processing nodes;

The Examiner correctly states that the combination of *Isfeld* and *Hagsand* does not disclose the steps of “determining a route for a unidirectional channel from a source processing node to a destination processing node within the array of processor nodes” and “generating the unidirectional channel along the determined route from the source processing node to the destination processing node” as recited in claim 1 (*Final Office Action*, p. 3, para. 5 and continued on p. 4, para. 1)

Chuprun does not cure the deficiencies of *Isfeld* and *Hagsand* with respect to claim 1. *Chuprun* discloses a system for identifying a **bi-directional** path in a mobile network such as

used for cell phones. First, *Chuprun* is not in an appropriate technical field to be a reference related to the current Application, since mobile networks are technically far removed from (unidirectional data transmission in) multi-processor systems and (unidirectional) data transmission within an array of processing nodes. A practitioner solving problems in the latter fields would not look to mobile networks of cell phones for answers. To aid compact prosecution, the Examiner is urged to include the most relevant technical fields in his search. Second, *Chuprun* fails to teach arrays of processing nodes having fixed locations (in other words: fixed in place). Note that a plurality of nodes is not necessarily an **array** of nodes as clearly set forth in amended claim 1. Third, *Chuprun* fails to teach unidirectional data transmission. *Chuprun's* communication network of transceivers is obviously for bidirectional communication, not unidirectional data transmission.

Claims 2-6, 8-10, 12, 13, 81-84, 88, and 89

Regarding claims 2-6, 8-10, 12, 13, 81-84, 88, and 89, the Applicants contend that these claims are at least patentable because they depend on an otherwise patentable independent claim, and incorporate the elements of claim 1 in addition to the distinguishing limitations they recite. Therefore, claims 2-6, 8-10, 12, 13, 81-84, 88, and 89 are patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and should also be allowed.

Claims 14-19, 21-23, 25, 26, and 85-87

Independent claim 14 contains elements that distinguish the claimed embodiment from *Isfeld* and *Hagsand*, and *Chuprun* similarly to those discussed above for claim 1. Therefore, claim 14 should be allowed for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 15-19, 21-23, 25-26, and 85-87 depend from independent claim 14 and incorporate the elements of claim 14 in addition to the patentably distinguishing limitations they recite. Therefore, claims 15-19, 21-23, 25-26, and 85-87 are patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 14 and should also be allowed.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of *Isfeld*, *Hagsand*, *Chuprun* and *Plante*

The Examiner rejects claims 7 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Isfeld* in view of *Hagsand* in view of *Chuprun* and further in view of United States Patent Publication No. 2004/0208602 (*Plante*). The Applicants contend that *Plante* fails to alleviate *Chuprun*'s failure to teach **uni-directional** data transmission and a fixed **array** of processing nodes. Regarding claims 7 and 20, the Applicants contend that these claims are at least patentable because they depend on otherwise patentable independent claims, in addition to the distinguishing limitations they recite.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of *Isfeld*, *Hagsand*, *Chuprun* and *Pitts*

The Examiner rejects claims 11 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Isfeld* in view of *Hagsand* in view of *Chuprun* and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,505,241 (*Pitts*). The Applicants contend that *Pitts* fails to alleviate *Chuprun*'s failure to teach **uni-directional** data transmission and a fixed **array** of processing nodes. Regarding claims 11 and 24, the Applicants contend that these claims are at least patentable because they depend on otherwise patentable independent claims, in addition to the distinguishing limitations they recite.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants request all §103 rejections to the claims be withdrawn, since *Isfeld*, *Hagsand* and *Chuprun* fail to teach uni-directional data transmission and a fixed array of processing nodes.

The Applicants contend that the pending claims in the present Application are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the Application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-0600 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Ricardo Gonzalez *et al.*

Date: August 17, 2010

By: /Steve Bachmann/
Steve Bachmann (Reg. No. 50,806)
Carr & Ferrell LLP
2200 Geng Road
Palo Alto, CA 94303
Phone: (650) 812-3400
Fax: (650) 812-3444